

Krzysztof Migdalski

University of Wrocław

On Two Sources of Second Position Effects (Part 1)¹

Abstract

This paper accounts for the distribution of two second position effects, the V2 (verb second) order observed in continental Germanic languages and second position cliticization, attested in some Slavic languages. It shows that it is necessary to distinguish two types of second position effects: one of them affects finite verbs and pronominal and auxiliary clitics, whereas the other one is restricted to the contexts of marked illocution and is observed among a small class of so-called operator clitics. Furthermore, this paper addresses Bošković's (2016) generalization concerning the distribution of clitics, which states that second position pronominal and auxiliary clitics are found only in languages without articles. This paper shows that although this generalization is empirically correct, it does not account for the distribution of auxiliary clitics and is not supported by diachronic considerations. It proposes an alternative generalization, which restricts verb-adjacent cliticization to tensed environments.

Keywords

V2, clitics, Slavic, Germanic, tense, diachronic syntax

Streszczenie

Niniejszy artykuł przedstawia analizę dwóch zjawisk składniowych, które są podporządkowane tzw. regule drugiej pozycji: zjawiska V2 obserwowanego we wszystkich językach germańskich oprócz angielskiego oraz klitycyzację drugiej pozycji (Wackernagela), która występuje w niektórych językach słowiańskich. Autor artykułu wskazuje na konieczność rozróżnienia dwóch odrębnych typów reguły drugiej pozycji: pierwszy z nich dotyczy finitywnych form czasownika oraz klityk zaimków osobowych i czasowników posiłkowych, a drugi typ jest odpowiedzialny za występowanie klityk zdaniowych w zdaniach wyrażających nacechowaną formę siły ilokucyjnej. Ponadto niniejszy artykuł nawiązuje do generalizacji Boškovića (2016) dotyczącej pozycji klityk w zdaniu. Zgodnie z tą generalizacją klityki drugiej pozycji występują jedynie w językach bez przed-

¹ I am grateful to Hakyung Jung, Aida Talić, and Neda Todorović for their feedback and help with the language data. I also thank the two anonymous reviewers for their insightful and challenging comments, which significantly improved this paper. All errors remain my own responsibility.

imków. Artykuł ten wykazuje, że chociaż generalizacja ta jest empirycznie poprawna, to nie uwzględnia ona dystrybucji klityk czasowników posiłkowych i nie jest ona poparta obserwacjami diachronicznymi. W artykule zaproponowano alternatywną generalizację, która wiąże obecność klityk przyczasownikowych w języku z dostępnością wykładników morfologicznych czasu.

Słowa kluczowe

V2, klityki, języki słowiańskie, języki germańskie, czas, składnia diachroniczna

1. Properties of V2 and second position cliticization

This paper addresses two second position effects observed in syntax: Wackernagel (second position) cliticization and the V2 (Verb Second) rule. The former effect is attested in a number of Slavic languages, including Czech, Slovak, Serbo-Croatian, and Slovenian. It consists in the placement of auxiliary and pronominal clitics in the second position of a clause, following the first constituent, as illustrated for the sequence of the auxiliary clitic *si* and the dative clitic *mi* in Serbo-Croatian in (1). As shown in this example, the clitics may be located after the first complex NP, the AP modifying the NP, or the modifier of the AP. The clitics are prosodically deficient, but their placement in second position is a result of a syntactic operation, as all the clause-initial elements that precede them are syntactic constituents, which may undergo syntactic movement.

- (1) a. Veoma lepu haljinu *si* *mi* kupio
 very beautiful_{ACC} dress_{ACC} are_{AUX} me_{DAT} buy_{PART.M.SG.}
 b. Veoma lepu *si* *mi* haljinu kupio
 very beautiful_{ACC} are_{AUX} me_{DAT} dress_{ACC} buy_{PART.M.SG.}
 c. Veoma *si* *mi* lepu haljinu kupio
 very are_{AUX} me_{DAT} beautiful_{ACC} dress_{ACC} buy_{PART.M.SG.}
 “You’ve bought me a very beautiful dress” (S-C, Tomić 1996: 817)

The clitics are required to be located in second position also in subordinate clauses, in which they follow the complementizer, as given in (2).

- (2) Ona tvrdi da *smo* *mu* *je* *mi* predstavili juče
 she claims that are_{AUX} him_{DAT} her_{ACC} we introduce_{PART.M.PL} yesterday
 “She claims that we introduced her to him yesterday” (S-C, Bošković 2001: 8)

The other second position effect is observed in all the contemporary Germanic languages with the exception of English, and it involves obligatory placement of a finite verb after the clause-initial constituent, as shown in (3) for Dutch.

- (3) a. Ik heb een huis met een tuintje gehuurd
 I have a house with a garden_{DIM} rented
 “I rented a house with a little garden”

- b. Gisteren heb ik een huis met een tuintje gehuurd
 yesterday have I a house with a garden_{DIM} rented
 “Yesterday I rented a house with a little garden” (Dutch; Zwart 1993: 297)

With the exception of Faroese, Icelandic, and Yiddish, all Germanic languages are asymmetric V2 languages, which means that in embedded clauses V2 structures are in general excluded, and the finite verb occurs clause-finally, as given in (4) for Dutch.

- (4) a. Ik geloof [_{CP} dat [_{TP} Jan de waarheid spreekt]]
 I believe that Jan the truth speaks
 “I believe that Jan is telling the truth”
 b. *Ik geloof dat spreekt_i Jan de waarheid t_i (Dutch)

The impossibility of V2 movement in subordinate clauses shows that the fronted verb is in complementary distribution with the complementizer. This observation has been captured in syntactic terms by Den Besten (1977/1983), who postulates that in V2 languages the finite verb moves from its base position in V⁰ and raises to C⁰, replacing the complementizer. It has been pointed out in subsequent analyses, however, that Den Besten’s proposal is unlikely to hold for all V2 contexts (see, for instance, Travis 1984; Zwart 1993; and Postma 2013). For example, the finite verb may be preceded by many different elements in V2 clauses, which include not only the subject (as in 3a) or a topicalized adverbial of time (as in 3b), but also adverbials of place, topicalized VPs, predicative nouns, and adjectives. Therefore, it does not seem plausible that the verb uniformly targets C⁰, and that the preverbal material is located in Spec, CP in all these environments (see also Frey 2006 for a discussion of the semantic effects triggered by the placement of different elements before the verb in V2 clauses).

Both V2 and second position cliticization are unusual syntactic phenomena. A property that unifies them is the requirement of the occurrence of an element that belongs to a certain natural class, the finite verb or a sequence of clitics, after a category-neutral, clause-initial constituent. This property is not readily observed in many other syntactic operations and poses a challenge for the assumptions made about movement in syntax. Generally, syntactic constituents undergo movement in order to establish a relation with another category. This relation results in feature checking when the moved constituent lands in a designated structural position. In the case of the second position effects analyzed in this paper, this type of procedure does not seem to necessarily apply. Namely, since the verb and the clitics may be preceded by virtually any syntactic constituent, they may be located in a different syntactic projection in each sentence. It is therefore unclear what feature could be checked by movement of the verb or clitics to second position, and the movement most likely does not result in uniform feature checking.

In recent minimalist approaches, movement may only apply if an Agree relationship has been established between a probe and its goal, and if the probe is equipped with an EPP feature. To account for the special properties of V2 structures (which involve head movement of the verb and subsequent XP-movement of some lexical material to the preverbal position), it has been proposed (see Jouitteau 2008; Roberts 2004) that V2 clauses instantiate EPP without Agree. The motivation behind this proposal is the observation that since basically any element may precede the verb in V2 structures, it is unlikely that there is an Agree relation between the pre-verbal element and the verb. Moreover, Bošković (2018) and Blümel (2017) argue that on the assumption that agreement involves feature-sharing, V2 structures do not instantiate feature-sharing, which in turn indicates that they cannot be labeled. If this line of reasoning is adopted, XP-movement of the lexical material that lands in the specifier preceding the verb in V2 structures proceeds like successive-cyclic movement under Chomsky's (2013) account. According to Bošković (2018), the lack of feature sharing explains why V2 clauses may not be affected by movement: non-agreeing specifiers delabel the relevant phrase which in consequence cannot undergo movement.

However, a somewhat problematic issue with this approach is that it tacitly presumes a uniform landing site for the verb and the preverbal element, such as C^0 and Spec, CP, respectively. Given the categorial variation of the elements that may potentially precede the finite verb or the clitics, it is unlikely that they target the same position in all structures. This fact is particularly challenging in the case of second position clitics, which comprise verbal, pronominal, and sentential elements that do not share any morphosyntactic features, so they cannot be all located in the same projection. The only property that unifies them is their prosodic deficiency. Furthermore, a more general question remains unanswered: even if V2 clauses involve EPP without Agree, it is still necessary to explain why such an operation is attested in continental Germanic languages, but not in English, or in the case of second position cliticization, why it is observed in Serbo-Croatian and Czech, but not in Bulgarian and Macedonian. In other words, it is crucial to establish a morphosyntactic condition that allows or precludes V2 and second position cliticization.

The special syntactic characteristics of the V2 order and second position cliticization have received significant attention in the literature. Both of the operations are typologically rather uncommon. Second position cliticization is not found in contemporary Germanic or Romance languages, which have verb-adjacent clitics. Outside Germanic, the V2 rule is also observed in Breton, Karitiana, Kashmiri, and it was possibly also attested in most Medieval Romance languages. In consequence of both the special syntactic properties of the second position effects as well as their relatively rare occurrence, a number of studies have been pursued since the early 1980s, with the aim of establishing

a parametric morphosyntactic condition that motivates or precludes second position placement. Initially, the major focus has been placed on the V2 rule, while second position cliticization received little attention. Thus, Koopman (1984) associated the V2 order with the way nominative case is assigned in different languages. She argued that in V2 languages nominative case is not assigned via a spec-head configuration, but rather under government from C^0 . In order to be able to assign nominative case, C^0 must be filled with lexical material, such as a complementizer in subordinate clauses. Since there are no complementizers in matrix clauses, the finite verb moves to C^0 and governs the subject. In the 1990s, in line with the research goals of Chomsky's (1995) Minimalist Program, the focus of attention shifted into finding a morphosyntactic feature that enables the derivation of V2, with proposals suggesting a tense and agreement feature on C^0 (Tomaselli 1990), finiteness operator [+F] (Holmberg and Platzack 1990), feature [+I] in Rizzi (1990), as well as *some* feature on C^0 (such as agreement, [+I], or [+F]), as assumed by Vikner (1995).

A number of studies on the V2 order have viewed the verb placement as a way of overtly manifesting the illocutionary force of a clause. These studies (see, for example, Hooper and Thompson 1973; Wechsler 1991; Brandner 2004; Julien 2015) have been influenced by observations concerning the possibility of verb movement to second position in some dialects of the Scandinavian languages. As was pointed out earlier, in most Germanic languages V2 is a main clause phenomenon. However, as will be shown later in this paper, some Scandinavian dialects permit the optional occurrence of the verb in second position in subordinate clauses depending on the degree of assertion expressed by the verb located in the matrix clause. Since assertion is a notion associated with illocution, it has been suggested that V2 may be a formal way of encoding the illocutionary force of a clause, and the finite verb checks a Force feature by movement to a Force-related projection, located in the left periphery of the clause.

As far as Wackernagel cliticization in the Slavic languages is concerned, it has received minor attention in the literature in comparison to the studies on the V2 order. Significantly, not all Slavic languages that have clitics display second position cliticization. Two Slavic languages, Bulgarian and Macedonian (see 5), feature verb-adjacent cliticization, on a par with Romance languages. Verb-adjacent clitics do not need to be located in second position (see 5b), but they may not be separated from the verb by any lexical material (see 5c).

- (5) a. Vera *mi* *go* dade včera
 Vera *me*_{DAT} *it*_{ACC} *gave*_{3SG} yesterday
 ‘Vera gave it to me yesterday’
 b. Včera Vera *mi go* dade
 c. *Vera *mi go* včera dade

(Bg; Franks and King 2000: 63)

In most analyses the two cliticization patterns observed in Slavic have been argued to result solely from different positions assumed by the clitics in the clause structure. For example, Franks (1998) postulates that whereas pronominal Wackernagel clitics originate in argument positions as Kase heads from which they move to agreement projections (the dative clitic to AgrIOP and the accusative clitic to AgrOP), verb-adjacent clitics are directly merged in agreement projections, and they do not need to raise there from a lower position. More recently, Roberts (2010) associates the cliticization patterns with phase heads and argues that whereas verb-adjacent clitics target v^0 , second position clitics adjoin to C^0 . A problem that these accounts face is that the two types of cliticization involve different movement operations, whose mechanisms cannot be reduced to divergent positions in the structure occupied by the respective clitic types (see Section 3 and Migdalski forthcoming). Furthermore, most of the analyses of cliticization presented so far in the literature do not establish an independent syntactic principle that conditions the availability of either type of cliticization. In this regard, a notable exception is Bošković's (2016) proposal, who puts forward a generalization that says that second position cliticization is attested only in languages without articles. However, although this generalization may capture the synchronic taxonomy of second position cliticization, it is not supported by diachronic considerations, and it does not extend to the V2 effect. Thus, the aim of this paper is to establish a more comprehensive condition that decides in a parametric way about the presence of second position effects in a language. In order to arrive at such a general condition, this paper examines two possible triggers of second position effects postulated in the literature: Force-marking and Tense-dependency. It consists of two parts and has the following organization. Section 2 examines V2 placement and the distribution of clitics in the contexts of marked illocutionary force. Section 3 turns to second position pronominal cliticization. The main aim of this section is to verify the predictions of Bošković's (2016) generalization. The second part of the paper (Migdalski forthcoming) examines the position of pronominal clitics. It begins with Section 4, which shows that the patterns of cliticization in Slavic depend on the availability of tense morphology, whereas Section 5 demonstrates that this dependency also obtains diachronically. Section 6 develops an alternative generalization concerning the clitic placement and relates it to the distribution of V2 clauses in Germanic.

2. Second position effects as Force indicators

The aim of this section is to determine whether second position effects can be viewed as an overt way of specifying the illocutionary force of a clause, as has often been argued for in the literature. Section 2.1 investigates the application

of the V2 rule in Force-related contexts, whereas Section 2.2 examines second position cliticization.

2.1. Specifying Force via V2

There are a number of empirical observations that support the idea of V2 being an overt way of specifying the illocutionary force of a clause. First, in most Germanic languages V2 structures are available only in matrix clauses. In embedded clauses the verb remains in situ (see example (4) in Section 1) and stays in complementary distribution with the complementizer. Since complementizers overtly express the illocutionary force (for instance, *that* marks clauses as declarative, and *if* introduces indirect questions), it seems legitimate to assume that the verb targets the same position as the complementizer (as in Den Besten 1977/1983), and that in matrix clauses it performs the Force-marking role of the complementizer.

Second, in some Scandinavian languages the verb may optionally occur in second position in subordinate clauses depending on the semantics expressed by the complementizer or the verb in the matrix clause in relation to the strength of assertion. This dependency is often descriptively captured via Hooper and Thompson's (1973) taxonomy of verbs in accordance with the discourse status of the complement clauses that they take, which is given in (6).

- (6) The Hooper & Thompson (1973) verb classes
- i. CLASS A – strongly assertive (*say, claim, assert, report, vow*)
 - ii. CLASS B – weakly assertive (*think, believe, suppose, guess, imagine*)
 - iii. CLASS C – non-assertive and non-factive (*doubt, deny, be possible*)
 - iv. CLASS D – factive (*regret, resent, be surprised*)
 - v. CLASS E – semi-factive (*know, discover, find out, forget*)

Scandinavian languages allow embedded V2 clauses when they are introduced by verbs from class A, B, and E (see Wiklund et al. 2009: 1915 for details). This means that an embedded V2 clause is more likely to be possible if its propositional content displays a high degree of assertion (and a low degree of presupposition). For instance, example (7a) permits the V2 order in the subordinate clause because it complements the verb *sa* 'said,' which encodes strong assertion. Conversely, the factive verb *angret* 'regretted' in (7b) expresses weak assertion, and the verb in the subordinate clause may not occur in second position.

- (7) a. Han sa at han kunne ikke synge i bryllupet
 He said that he could not sing in wedding-the
 "He said that he could not sing at the wedding"

(Norwegian; Wiklund et al. 2009: 1918)

- b. Han angret på at han ikke hadde sunget
 he regretted on that he not had sung
 “He regretted that he hadn’t sung”
 b.*Han angret på at han hadde ikke sunget

(Norwegian; Wiklund et al. 2009: 1920)

The link between the availability of V2 clauses and the strength of assertion expressed by the main verb has been captured in the literature in various ways. Recently, Biberauer (2016) has argued that the clauses that render strong assertion have a more robust functional field, which includes the Force head that is the landing site of the movement of the verb to second position in the embedded clause.

More generally, the observation of the relation between V2 placement in embedded clauses and the strength of assertion has given rise to the idea that V2 could be the source of Force marking also in matrix clauses. For example, Koster (2003) postulates that since in continental Germanic languages finite verbs are in complementary distribution with complementizers and the complementizer species illocutionary force, both the complementizer and the verb in second position encode Force. Correspondingly, Brandner (2004) argues, following Cheng’s (1997) Clausal Typing Hypothesis, that all clauses must be typed, which means that their Force value must be explicitly marked as declarative, interrogative, or of some other type. She suggests that the clause typing may arise as a result of movement, such as movement of the verb to second position² or *wh*-movement, or via insertion of a designated lexical element, such as Force-related particles located in C⁰ in languages such as Korean or Persian. The important ingredient of these proposals is that they uniformly attribute all instances of the V2 order to Force-marking. This is a controversial issue for a number of reasons. First, as pointed out by Holmberg (2015), it is unclear how Force could be marked in languages that have neither the V2 order nor display Force-encoding particles. Second, these proposals cannot be applied to languages such as Breton, in which verb fronting obligatorily occurs in all finite clauses and does not produce any special semantic effects. Third, the postulate of a direct relationship between Force-marking and the V2 order does not receive straightforward support even from Scandinavian languages. Thus, Wiklund (2010) points out that even though the V2 order is possible in highly-asserted subordinate clauses in Swedish, this order is only optional. If the verb does not raise to second position in such clauses, the Illocutionary Force expressed in such a clause is exactly the same and does not become “less-assertive,” as shown for the structures with the highly assertive verb *say* in (8a).

² An anonymous reviewer points out that the illocutionary force of a clause could also be manifested through other instances of verb movement, which do not necessarily lead to V2 placement, such as subject-verb inversion in *yes-no* questions, *if-then* conditional clauses (as in *Had George not come, we would have been embarrassed*), and in V1-imperative clauses.

- (8) a. Olle sa att han inte *hade* läst boken
 Olle said that he not had read book-the
 b. Olle sa att han *hade* inte läst boken
 Olle said that he had not read book-the
 “Olle said that he had not read the book” (Swedish; Wiklund 2010: 27)

To conclude, the empirical facts presented in this subsection indicate that the relationship between high assertion (and Force marking in general) and V2 is not uniform. Clauses that express high assertion are not necessarily required to follow the V2 order. Thus, the V2 structure is neither a necessary nor a sufficient condition to express Force.

2.2. Specifying Force via second position cliticization

As was pointed out earlier, Slavic languages have pronominal and auxiliary clitics, which may occur in second position or be adjacent to the verb. Moreover, they also feature a special class of second position clitics that express the illocutionary force of a clause. They include the particle *li*, which is found in most Slavic languages, where it marks interrogation or focus on the element that precedes it. Czech, Polish, and Russian have the operator clitic *že/žē*, which similarly to *li* licenses focus. Operator clitics are also widely attested in Old Slavic: apart from *li* and *že*, Old Church Slavonic had the indicative complementizer *bo* and the ethical dative. *Bo* has maintained the function of the complementizer in Czech and Polish, but it has lost its clitic status. The ethical dative is still found in many Slavic languages, with various degrees of productivity. It does not refer to an argument, but it is used for pragmatic reasons, to attract the hearer's attention.

Even though operator clitics target second position, they do not form a natural class with the second position pronominal and auxiliary clitics found in languages such as Serbo-Croatian. As will be shown below, they exhibit special syntactic properties, related to their position in the structure and the categorial requirements they impose on their host. Moreover, operator clitics uniformly occur in second position across Slavic, in the languages that have second position pronominal and auxiliary cliticization, verb-adjacent clitics, or no pronominal and auxiliary clitics at all (Russian and Ukrainian). Thus, example (9) shows that in Bulgarian the operator clitic *li* follows the clause-initial adverbial *včera*, and it has a different distribution than the pronominal clitic *ja* and the auxiliary *e*, which are verb-adjacent clitics.

- (9) Včera *li* Penka *ja* *e* dala knigata na Petko?
 yesterday Q Penka her_{ACC} is_{AUX} give_{PART.ESG} book-the to Petko
 “Was it yesterday that Penka gave the book to Petko?” (Bg; Tomić 1996: 833)

Bošković (2001: 60) provides syntactic evidence suggesting that operator clitics occupy a different position in the structure than the other clitics also in languages with second position pronominal cliticization. Namely, he observes a contrast in the placement of ethical datives and argumental dative clitics with respect to sentential adverbs, which is presented in (10) and (11). These examples contain the adverbs *pravilno* ‘correctly’ and *mudro* ‘cleverly,’ which are ambiguous as they may have both manner and sentential readings. Bošković points out that when the dative clitic *ti* functions as an ethical dative, *pravilno* can be interpreted as both a manner and a sentential adverb. Conversely, when the dative clitic *ti* is argumental dative (see 11), the ambiguous adverbs permit only the manner interpretation.

- (10) Oni *su* *ti* *pravilno* odgovorili Mileni
 they are_{AUX} you_{DAT} correctly answer_{PART.M.PL} Milena_{DAT}
 “*They did the right thing in answering Milena”
 “*They gave Milena a correct answer” (S-C; Bošković 2001: 60)

- (11) a. Oni *su* *joj* *pravilno* odgovorili
 they are_{AUX} her_{DAT} correctly answer_{PART.M.PL}
 “*They did the right thing in answering her”
 “*They gave her a correct answer”
 b. Oni *su* *ga* *mudro* prodali
 they are_{AUX} it_{ACC} wisely sell_{PART.M.PL}
 “*It was wise of them to sell it”
 “*They sold it in a wise manner” (S-C; Bošković 2001: 51)

Bošković (2001: 60) argues that since sentential adverbs are located higher in the structure than manner adverbs, the fact that only the manner reading is possible with argumental dative clitics suggests that they are hosted in a lower position than ethical dative clitics.

Another special property of operator clitics, which distinguishes them from auxiliary and pronominal clitics, is the fact that they may impose restrictions on the syntactic status of their hosts. As illustrated in (12), in Serbo-Croatian the auxiliary clitic may receive prosodic support from both heads and phrasal elements. By contrast, as shown for the corresponding examples in (13), the operator clitic *li* may be preceded exclusively by heads.

- (12) a. Skupe (*je*) knjige (*je*) Ana čitala
 expensive is_{AUX} books is_{AUX} Ana read
 “Ana read expensive books”
 b. Čiju (*je*) ženu (*je*) Petar volio?
 whose is_{AUX} wife is_{AUX} Peter love_{PART.M.SG}
 “Whose wife did Peter love?” (S-C; Bošković 2001: 27)

- (13) a. Skupe (li) knjige (*li) Ana čita?
 expensive Q books Q Ana reads
 “Does Ana read expensive books?”
 a. Čiju (li) ženu (*li) Petar voli?
 whose Q wife Q Petar loves
 “Whose wife does Petar love?” (S-C; Bošković 2001: 27)

The operator clitic *li* assigns focus to the preceding element. Since elements that receive focus could in principle be more complex than a single word, the fact that phrasal material in front of *li* is disallowed must be due to a syntactic restriction. Bošković (2001: 31ff.) postulates that *li* in Serbo-Croatian is defective in the sense of not being able to support a specifier, and in consequence the focal feature of *li* may be checked only via head movement.

Another restriction that may be imposed by operator clitics is concerned with the categorial status of their hosts. As presented in (14a), in Czech *li* may only encliticize on finite verbs, and the contexts such as the one in (14b), in which *li* is preceded by non-verbal elements such as a noun or an adverb, are excluded. This restriction holds only for operator clitics, as other clitics in Czech do not display any categorial restrictions on their hosts.

- (14) a. Máte-li pochyby, zatelefonujte na informace
 have_{2PL}+Q doubts call_{2PL} at information
 “If you have doubts, call the information”
 b. *Pochyby/ *dnes- li máte...
 doubts/ today Q have_{2PL} (Cz; Toman 1996: 508)

The data overviewed in this section indicate that the clitics that express Force form an independent class of second position clitics, as they display different syntactic properties than pronominal and auxiliary clitics. Therefore, on the assumption that second position cliticization and V2 are uniform syntactic phenomena, these data provide more evidence against the assumption that second position effects uniformly express illocutionary force.

3. The source of second position pronominal cliticization: Bošković’s (2016) generalization

This part of the paper addresses second position pronominal cliticization, which as I have shown above, cannot be attributed to Force-marking. The general aim of the subsequent parts of this paper (including Migdalski forthcoming) is to determine a morphosyntactic property that precludes or enables the occurrence of second position pronominal cliticization. As was pointed out in Section 1, a number of analyses that have been proposed since the early 1980s postulated various morphosyntactic parameters that conditioned the V2 effect.

Since these analyses focused on the Germanic languages, they did not address the phenomenon of second position cliticization. Recently, Bošković (2016) put forward a generalization which states that second position clitics are found only in languages without articles. Although Bošković's proposal is empirically correct, Migdalski (forthcoming) presents an alternative generalization, which is backed up by diachronic considerations. It also seems to be more comprehensive, as it accounts for both second position clitic and V2 placement.

Bošković's (2016) generalization is based on an extensive study of fifty-two article-less languages, covering Slavic, Romance, Pama-Nyungan, Iranian, and Uto-Aztecan language groups. Bošković assumes that these languages do not project the DP layer in the functional structure of noun phrases. Moreover, he argues that the lack of DP has repercussions for the structure of pronouns, which are NPs in languages without articles and Ds taking NP complements in article languages. Bošković observes that since D is a functional element, pronouns in DP languages display properties of functional elements, such as for example the fact that they cannot be stranded. What this implies for the syntax of verb-adjacent clitics is that they must take a complement or assume a head-adjunction configuration if they do not have any complements, or else they will be stranded. This is the reason, according to Bošković, why verb-adjacent clitics cluster and adjoin to V+T complexes. By contrast, second position clitics are NP-elements that target specifiers of different projections. The difference in the derivation of verb-adjacent and second position cliticization is reflected in a number of distinct properties that these two types of clitics display with respect to ellipsis, clustering, movement, and the PCC constraint, which were observed in the literature earlier, independently of the DP/NP distinction assumed by Bošković (see Stjepanović 1998, 1999; Bošković 2001; Migdalski 2006: 215–218). For instance, as indicated in (15a) for Serbo-Croatian, second position pronominal clitics can be split from each other by a parenthetical. By contrast, the Bulgarian examples in (15b) show that the split is not possible in languages with verb-adjacent clitics.

- (15) a. *Ti si me, kao što sam već rekla, lišio*
 you are_{AUX} me_{DAT} as am_{AUX} already say_{PART.ESG} deprive_{PART.M.SG}
ih juče
 them_{DAT} yesterday
 "You, as I already said, deprived me of them" (S-C; Bošković 2001: 60)
- b. **Te sa, kakto ti kazah, predstavili gi na Petūr*
 they are_{AUX} as you_{DAT} told introduced them_{ACC} to Peter
 "They have, as I told you, introduced them to Peter" (Bg; Bošković 2001: 189)

Moreover, some of second position clitics occurring in a sequence may be affected by ellipsis, as shown for Serbo-Croatian in (16). Conversely, as presented in (see 17), no part of the clitic cluster can be elided in Bulgarian.

- (16) a. Mi *smo* *mu* *ga* dali, a i
 we are_{AUX} him_{DAT} it_{ACC} give_{PART.M.PL} and also
 vi *ste* ~~*mu*~~ ~~*ga*~~ ~~dali,~~ takodje
 you are_{AUX} him_{DAT} it_{ACC} give_{PART.M.PL} too
 “We gave it to him, and you did, too” (S-C; Stjepanović 1998: 530)
- b. Mi *smo mu ga* dali, a i vi *ste mu ga* dali, takodje
 c. *Mi *smo mu ga* dali, a i vi *ste mu ga* dali, takodje (S-C; Stjepanović 1998: 532)
- (17) *Nie *sme* *mu* *go* dali, i vie
 we are_{AUX} him_{DAT} it_{ACC} give_{PART.M.PL} and you
 ste ~~*mu*~~ ~~*go*~~ ~~dali~~ (sušto)
 are_{AUX} him_{DAT} it_{ACC} give_{PART.M.PL} too
 “We gave it to him, and you did too” (Bg, Bošković 2002: 331)

Furthermore, second position clitics display a greater degree of mobility within the structure. For instance, as has been first observed by Progovac (1993), in Serbo-Croatian pronominal clitics may climb from an embedded clause selected by subjunctive-complement taking verbs, such as ‘to wish’ (see 18). By contrast, the climbing is not possible out of a subordinate clause selected by indicative-complement taking verbs, such as ‘to say’ (see 19).

- (18) a. Milan želi da *ga* vidi
 Milan wishes that him_{ACC} sees
 “Milan wishes to see him”
 b. ?Milan *ga želi* da vidi (S-C; Progovac 2005: 146)
- (19) a. Milan kaže da *ga* vidi
 Milan says that him_{ACC} sees
 “Milan says that he can see him”
 b. *Milan *ga kaže* da vidi (S-C; Progovac 2005: 146)

As noted by Migdalski (2006: 217), in Bulgarian clitic climbing is not possible with any types of verb located in the main clause.

- (20) a. Manol iska da *go* vidi
 Manol wishes that him_{ACC} sees
 “Manol wishes to see him”
 b. *Manol *go iska* da vidi (Bg; Migdalski 2006: 217)
- (21) a. Manol kazva će *go* vižda
 Manol says that him_{ACC} sees
 “Manol says that he can see him”
 b. *Manol *go kazva* će vižda (Bg; Migdalski 2006: 217)

The contrast with respect to clitic climbing suggests in my view that second position pronominal clitics display more robust movement possibilities,

which are typical of XP-elements, and that they target XP projections, whereas verb-adjacent clitics adjoin to a head projection, hence their movement is more restricted.

Finally, as I observed in Migdalski (2006: 217–218), more evidence for the XP-status of second position pronominal clitics comes from their interaction with negation. The negation particle *ne*, standardly analyzed as a head, attracts and incorporates into other verbal or pronominal elements in Slavic. In line with Chain Uniformity Condition, incorporation may only occur between two head elements, thus negation may incorporate into pronominal clitics in Bulgarian, as shown in (22), but not in Serbo-Croatian, as shown in (23), where negation incorporates into the finite verb instead.

- (22) a. *Ne me boli*
 NEG me_{ACC} hurt_{3SG}
 ‘‘It doesn’t hurt me’’
 a.’ **Ne boli me*
 b. *Ne mi se struva, e ...*
 NEG me_{DAT} REFL seem_{3SG} that
 ‘‘It doesn’t seem to me that...’’
 b.’ **Ne struva mi se, e...* (Bg; Migdalski 2006: 218)

- (23) a. *Ne boli me*
 NEG hurt_{3SG} me_{ACC}
 ‘‘It doesn’t hurt me’’
 a.’ **Ne me boli*
 b. *Ne ini mi se da...*
 NEG seem_{3SG} me_{DAT} REFL that
 ‘‘It doesn’t seem to me that...’’
 b.’ **Ne mi se ini da...* (S-C; Migdalski 2006: 218)

As was noted above, Bošković (2016) accounts for the systematic differences in the distribution of clitics illustrated in these examples by assuming that while verb-adjacent clitics are spell-outs of the functional head D^0 , which adjoin to the V/T complex to avoid being stranded, there is no adjunction requirement for second position clitics, which are NPs. The contrast also reflects the way the clitics check case: verb-adjacent clitics check case via incorporation, while second position clitics do it by raising to the specifiers of independent, case-licensing projections

In what follows I point out a number of issues with Bošković’s (2016) proposal, and in the second part of this paper (Migdalski forthcoming) I suggest a modification of his generalization. Admittedly, Bošković’s postulate that verb-adjacent clitics are D-heads receives support from most Romance languages, in which clitics resemble determiners. For example, in French the 3rd person accusative clitic is homophonous with the definite article. However, in the two Slavic

languages with verb-adjacent clitics and articles this similarity is not observed. Rather, irrespective of the availability of articles, pronominal clitics in all Slavic languages resemble morphological case forms. In fact, Franks and Rudin (2005) suggest that although pronominal clitics in Romance languages instantiate D-heads, in Slavic they are K(ase)-heads: in the Slavic languages with articles KP is the topmost functional projection for nominals, and the K^0 takes DP as its complement (see 24a), whereas in the article-less Slavic languages KP exhaustively dominates K^0 , and the DP projection is absent (see 24b).

- (24) a. [KP K^0 [DP ...]
 b. [KP K^0]

Although Franks and Rudin do not explicitly address the morphological make-up of the pronominal elements, their proposal receives support from the morphological affinity between pronominal clitics and case morphology that I refer to above.

Another issue with Bošković's (2016) generalization is the fact that, as I also point out in Migdalski (2016: 146), his analysis does not readily account for the position of auxiliary clitics, which include forms of the verb 'to be.' They are not nominal elements, so it is unlikely that they are D-heads or that they need to incorporate into the V/T complex for case licensing. Regardless, the auxiliary clitics adjoin to T^0 on a par with pronominal clitics. In Bošković's (2016) view, this mechanism occurs because of "a preference to treat them like pronominal clitics for uniformity." It is not clear though how this mechanism of preference could be captured in formal terms.

Moreover, Bošković's generalization is problematic for conceptual reasons. It implies that pronominal clitics have a radically different categorial status in the two language groups: they are purportedly functional elements if they are verb-adjacent clitics, and they are lexical items if they are second position clitics. This division means in turn that even though the two types of clitics are largely the same morphologically and semantically across Slavic, only verb-adjacent clitics constitute closed lexical classes and lack descriptive content (see Abney 1987 and Giusti 1997 for a discussion of properties of functional categories).

Furthermore, Bošković's generalization is not supported by diachronic considerations. As will be shown in detail in the second part of this paper (Migdalski forthcoming), Old Church Slavonic did not have second position pronominal clitics but rather predominantly featured verb-adjacent cliticization, so on Bošković's account it could be a DP language. The status of noun phrases in Old Church Slavonic is a matter of debate though. Articles are not attested in Old Church Slavonic texts, although Dimitrova-Vulchanova and Vulchanov (2012) observe that *Codex Suprasliensis*, a late Old Church Slavonic document from the 11th century, contains the demonstrative *tō*, which in some environments may function as the definite article. These environments

include contexts in which it cliticizes on different categories within nominal expressions and lacks the deictic function of the demonstrative. According to Dimitrova-Vulchanova and Vulchanov, *tb* was the source of the article in Bulgarian and Macedonian, the only Slavic languages that developed articles. However, a problem with this idea is that Old Church Slavonic displays numerous cases of Left Branch Extraction, which in general is not observed in languages with articles, but is typical of DP-less languages. Left Branch Extraction is illustrated in an Old Church Slavonic example from the 9th-century text “On the Letters” in (25), in which the second position clitic *bo*, which functions as a complementizer, occurs between the AP modifier *svętb* and the head noun *mōš*.

- (25) *Svētb bo mōš stvorilъ ja estъ*
 holy because man created them_{ACC} is
 “Because a holy man has created them” (OCS; Pancheva 2005: 139)

Related cases of Left Branch Extraction are also historically observed in Old Serbian, which did not have articles and was on the way to become a language with second position clitics, as presented in (26), where the clitic *je* splits the sequence of a demonstrative and a noun.

- (26) *Sijazi je kniga pisana*
 this is_{AUX} book written
 “This book was written” (OS; Radanović-Kocić 1988: 159)

To my knowledge there is also no evidence for the emergence or the decline of the article in the subsequent history of Serbian, including the Montenegrin dialects, which featured verb-adjacent pronominal clitics in some contexts until as late as the 19th century (see Radanović-Kocić 1988: 164–168 and Section 5 in Migdalski forthcoming). The Montenegrin example from the 19th century given in (27), kindly provided by an anonymous reviewer, features Left Branch Extraction, with the dative clitic *mu* separating the AP *veliku* from the head noun *knjigu*.

- (27) *Veliku mu knjigu otvorio*
 great him_{DAT} book open_{PART.M.SG}
 “(He) opened a great book for him” (19th c. Montenegrin)

Thus, a problem with Bošković’s generalization is that it potentially predicts that a switch between verb-adjacent and second position cliticization systems was accompanied by a modification of the DP/NP layers, such as the emergence of the definite article. As far as I can determine, such a correspondence is not observed. Rather, as will be shown in the second part of this paper, published as Migdalski (forthcoming), the emergence of second position cliticization coincides with the loss of tense morphology.

References

- ABNEY Steven P. (1987). *The English NP in its Sentential Aspect*. Doctoral dissertation, MIT.
- BIBERAUER Theresa (2016). Afrikaans V2 and its implications for our understanding of V2 parametrisation. Paper presented at *Rethinking Verb Second*, St. John's College, University of Cambridge, 22–24 March 2016.
- BLÜMEL Andreas (2017). Exocentric root declaratives: Evidence from V2. In *Labels and roots*, Leah BAUKE, Andreas BLÜMEL (eds.), 263–286. Berlin: de Gruyter Mouton.
- BOŠKOVIĆ Željko (2001). *On the Nature of the Syntax–Phonology Interface. Cliticization and Related Phenomena*. Amsterdam: Elsevier.
- BOŠKOVIĆ Željko (2016). On second position clitics crosslinguistically. In *Formal Studies in Slovenian Syntax: In honor of Janez Orešnik*, Franc Lanko MARUŠIČ, Rok ŽAUCER (eds.), 23–53. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- BOŠKOVIĆ Željko (2018). On movement out of moved elements, labels, and phases. *Linguistic Inquiry* 49(2), 247–282.
- BRANDNER Ellen (2004). Head-movement in minimalism, and V2 as FORCE-marking. In *The Syntax and Semantics of the Left Periphery*, Horst LOHNSTEIN, Susanne TRISLER (eds.), 97–138. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- CHENG Lisa (1997). *On the Typology of Wh-Questions*. New York: Garland.
- CHOMSKY Noam (1995). *The Minimalist Program*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- CHOMSKY Noam (2013). Problems of projection. *Lingua* 130, 33–49.
- DEN BESTEN Hans (1977/1983). On the interaction of root transformations and lexical deletive rules. In *On the Formal Syntax of the Westgermania*, Werner ABRAHAM (ed.), 47–131. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- DIMITROVA-VULCHANOVA Mila, VULCHANOV Valentin (2012). An article evolving: The case of Old Bulgarian. In *Grammatical Change: Origins, Nature, Outcomes*, Dianne JONAS, John WHITMAN, Andrew GARRETT (eds.), 160–178. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- FRANKS Steven (1998). Clitics in Slavic. Paper presented at Comparative Slavic Morphosyntax Workshop, Bloomington, Indiana.
- FRANKS Steven, KING Tracy Holloway (2000). *A Handbook of Slavic Clitics*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- FRANKS Steven, Catherine RUDIN (2005). Bulgarian clitics as K⁰ heads. In *Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics: The South Carolina Meeting, 2004*, Steven FRANKS, Frank Y. GLADNEY, Mila TASSEVA-KURKTCHIEVA (eds.) 104–116. Ann Arbor: Michigan Slavic Publications.
- FREY Werner (2006). Contrast and movement to the German prefield. In *The Architecture of Focus*, Valéria MOLNÁR, Susanne WINKLER (eds.), 235–264. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- GIUSTI Giuliana (1997). The categorial status of determiners. In *The New Comparative Syntax*, Liliane HAEGEMAN (ed.), 95–123. London: Addison Wesley Longman.
- HOLMBERG Anders (2015). Verb second. In *Syntax – Theory and Analysis. An International Handbook. Volume 1*, Tibor KISS, Artemis ALEXIADOU (eds.), 342–383. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

- HOLMBERG Anders, PLATZACK Christer (1990). On the role of inflection in Scandinavian syntax. In *Issues in Germanic Syntax: Trends in Linguistics, Studies and Monographs* 44, Werner ABRAHAM, Wim KOSMEIJER, Eric REULAND (eds.), 93–118. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- HOOPER Joan, THOMPSON Sandra (1973). On the applicability of root transformations. *Linguistic Inquiry* 4(4), 465–497.
- JOUITTEAU Mélanie (2008). The Brythonic reconciliation. In *Linguistic Variation Yearbook*, Jeroen van Craenenbroeck (ed.), 163–200. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- JULIEN Marit (2015). The force of V2 revisited. *Journal of Comparative Germanic Linguistics* 18, 139–181.
- KOOPMAN Hilda (1984). *The Syntax of Verbs*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- KOSTER Jan (2003). All languages are tense-second. In *Germania et alia: A Linguistic Webschrift for Hans den Besten*, Jan KOSTER, Henk van RIEMSDIJK (eds.), Electronic publication, Tilburg/Groningen: University of Groningen.
- MASCARÓ Joan, NESPOR Marina (1990). *Grammar in Progress: Essays in Honour of Henk van Riemsdijk*. Groningen: Foris.
- MIGDALSKI Krzysztof (2006). *The Syntax of Compound Tenses in Slavic*. Doctoral dissertation, Tilburg University.
- MIGDALSKI Krzysztof (2016). *Second Position Effects in the Syntax of Germanic and Slavic Languages*. Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego.
- MIGDALSKI Krzysztof (forthcoming). On two sources of second position effects (Part 2). *Studies in Polish Linguistics* 13(4).
- PANCHEVA Roumyana (2005). The rise and fall of second-position clitics. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 23(1), 103–167.
- POSTMA Gertjan (2013). Clause-typing by [2] – The loss of the 2nd person pronoun *du* ‘you’ in Dutch, Frisian and Limburgian dialects. In *Information Structure and Agreement*, Victoria CAMACHO-TABOADA, Ángel L. JIMÉNEZ-FERNÁNDEZ, Javier MARTÍN-GONZÁLEZ, Mariano REYES-TEJEDOR (eds.), 217–254. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- PROGOVAC Ljiljana (1993). Locality and subjunctive-like complements in Serbo-Croatian. *Journal of Slavic Linguistics* 1(1), 116–144.
- PROGOVAC Ljiljana (2005). *The Syntax of Serbian: Clausal Architecture*. Bloomington: Slavica.
- RADANOVIĆ-KOČIĆ Vesna (1988). *The Grammar of Serbo-Croatian Clitics: A Synchronic and Diachronic Perspective*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign.
- RIZZI Luigi (1990). Speculations on verb-second. In MASCARÓ, NESPOR (eds.), 375–386.
- ROBERTS Ian (2004). The C-System in Brythonic Celtic Languages, V2, and the EPP. In *The Structure of IP and CP*, volume 2, Luigi RIZZI (ed.), 297–327. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.
- ROBERTS Ian (2010). *Agreement and Head Movement: Clitics, Incorporation, and Defective Goals*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- STJEPANOVIĆ Sandra (1998). On the placement of Serbo-Croatian Clitics: Evidence from VP ellipsis. *Linguistic Inquiry* 29(3), 527–537.
- STJEPANOVIĆ Sandra (1999). *What do Second Position Cliticization, Scrambling, and Multiple wh-fronting Have in Common?* Doctoral dissertation, University of Connecticut.

- TOMAN Jindřich (1996). A note on clitics and prosody. In *Approaching Second: Second Position Clitics and Related Phenomena*, Aaron HALPERN, Arnold M. ZWICKY (eds.), 505–510. Stanford: CSLI Publications.
- TOMASELLI Alessandra (1990). COMP as a licensing head: An argument based on cliticization. In MASCARÒ, NESPOR (eds.), 433–445.
- TOMIĆ Olga (1996). The Balkan Slavic clausal clitics. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 14(4), 811–872.
- TRAVIS Lisa (1984). *Parameters and Effects of Word Order Variation*. Doctoral dissertation, MIT.
- VIKNER Sten (1995). *Verb Movement and Expletive Subjects in the Germanic Languages*. New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- WECHSLER Stephen (1991). Verb second and illocutionary force. In *Views on Phrase Structure*, Katherine LEFFEL, Denis BOUCHARD (eds.), 177–191. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- WIKLUND Anna-Lena (2010). In search of the force of dependent verb second. *Nordic Journal of Linguistics* 33(1), 81–91.
- WIKLUND Anna-Lena, BENTZEN Kristine, HRAFNBJARGARSON Gunnar Hrafn, HRÓARSDÓTTIR Þorbjörg (2009). On the distribution and illocution of V2 in Scandinavian *that*-clauses. *Lingua* 119, 1914–1938.
- ZWART Jan-Wouter (1993). Verb movement and complementizer agreement. In *Papers on Case and Agreement I*, Jonathan BOBALJIK, Colin PHILLIPS (eds.), *MIT Working Papers in Linguistics*, 18: 297–340.

Krzysztof Migdalski
 Uniwersytet Wrocławski
 Instytut Filologii Angielskiej
 ul. Kuźnicza 22, 50-138 Wrocław
 [krzysztof.migdalski@uwr.edu.pl]